

MINUTES
SAN DIEGO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
Regular Meeting – February 10, 2006
DPLU Hearing Room, 9:00 a.m.

The meeting convened at 9:03 a.m. and adjourned at 10:27 a.m.

A. ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present: Beck, Brooks, Day, Kreitzer, Miller, Riess, Woods

Commissioners Absent: None

Advisors Present: Beech, Sinsay (DPW); Taylor (OCC)

Staff Present: Beddow, Farace, Hulse, Martinez, Muto, Pryor, Russell, Turner, Jones (recording secretary)

B. Statement of Planning Commission's Proceedings, Approval of Minutes for the Meeting of January 27, 2006

Action: Riess – Miller

Approve the Minutes of January 27, 2006.

Ayes: 7 - Beck, Brooks, Day, Kreitzer, Miller, Riess, Woods
Noes: 0 - None
Abstain: 0 - None
Absent: 0 - None

C. Public Communication: Opportunity for members of the public to speak to the Commission on any subject matter within the Commission's jurisdiction but not an item on today's Agenda.

There were none.

D. Formation of Consent Calendar: Item 2

TPM 20855RPL¹, Agenda Item 1:

1. Hidden Oaks Court, Tentative Parcel Map (TPM) 20855RPL1, Valle de Oro Community Planning Area (continued from January 27, 2006)

Appeal, filed by representatives of the Valle de Oro Community Planning Group, of the Director of Planning and Land Use's decision approving Tentative Parcel Map (TPM) 20855RPL1. The proposed project is a minor subdivision of a 1.01-acre parcel into two one-half acre parcels. The Valle de Oro Planning Group's appeal suggests that the design of the subdivision does not meet the Subdivision Ordinance design requirements, that the drainage impacts of the development will negatively impact neighboring properties, and that the subdivision will have an adverse impact on community character. The project site is located at 1822 Hidden Oaks Court.

Staff Presentation: Martinez

Proponents: 1; **Opponents:** 0

Discussion:

On January 27, 2006, the Planning Commission tentatively granted the Valle de Oro Planning Group's appeal of the Director's decision approving this proposal, and denied TPM 20855RPL¹ by a vote of 4-2 (one Commissioner absent). Staff was then directed to return today with a Decision reflecting the Commission's Findings that (1) the Lot's oddly-shaped configuration, (2) the length-to-width ratio of the proposed Parcel 2, and (3) the intent of the original designer that this property remain a single Lot makes the proposal incompatible with the character of this community.

Action: Beck – Kreitzer

Adopt the Form of Decision granting the appeal and denying TPM 20855RPL¹.

Discussion of the Action:

Commissioner Beck reiterates his belief that it was the intent of the original designer that this property remains a single Lot, while Chairman Day and Commissioner Miller continue to voice support of the applicant's proposal.

Ayes:	5 -	Beck, Brooks, Kreitzer, Riess, Woods
Noes:	2 -	Day, Miller
Abstain:	0 -	None
Absent:	0 -	None

SPA 05-003 and R06-002, Agenda Item 2:

2. A-1 Self Storage, Specific Plan Amendment (SPA) 05-003 and Zone Reclassification R06-002, Lakeside Community Planning Area

Proposed Specific Plan Amendment (SPA) and Zone Reclassification that would change the height/story designator for Planning Area VII of the RiverWay Specific Plan from "E" (a maximum height of 30 feet and maximum of two stories) to "F" (a maximum height of 30 feet and a maximum of three stories). An A-1 Self Storage facility currently exists within Planning Area VII and the SPA and Zone Reclassification will convert existing third-floor attic space to commercial storage use. No exterior improvements to the building or parking area are proposed. The project site is located at 9893 Riverford Road in Lakeside.

Staff Presentation: Muto

Proponents: 2; **Opponents:** 0

Discussion:

This Item is approved on consent.

Action: Beck - Kreitzer

Recommend that the Board of Supervisors:

1. Adopt the Resolution approving SPA 05-003 for the A-1 Self Storage Specific Plan Amendment, which makes the appropriate Findings and includes those requirements and Conditions necessary to ensure that the project is implemented in a manner consistent with the State law and the County General Plan;
2. Adopt the Form of Ordinance changing the zoning classification of certain property in the Lakeside Community Planning Area, Ref. R06-002; and
3. Find that the Planning Commission has reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) dated August 2000, on file with the Department of Planning and Land Use, and Addendum dated January 3, 2006 prior to making its recommendation on the project.

Ayes: 7 - Beck, Brooks, Day, Kreitzer, Miller, Riess, Woods
Noes: 0 - None
Abstain: 0 - None
Absent: 0 - None

P56-020W¹, Agenda Item No. 3:

3. Church of the Good Shepherd, Major Use Permit Modification P56-020W¹, Sweetwater Community Planning Area

Requested Major Use Permit Modification to allow the addition of a new, 325-seat, 6,027 square-foot sanctuary with parking and utility improvements, a cosmetic remodel of the existing facilities, and the addition of a new, one-story 8,800 square-foot building with basement to replace the existing school building. This building will be used as a classroom and for meetings and storage. The applicant anticipates the use of this building for a new day-care facility that will accommodate a maximum of 60 children. The property is zoned RR1, Rural Residential Use Regulation, which allows Civic Use Types: Religious Assembly pursuant to Section 1370 of the Zoning Ordinance, and Child Care Center pursuant to Section 1332 of the Zoning Ordinance with approval of a Major Use Permit. The project site is located at 3390 Bonita Road.

Staff Presentation: Beddow

Proponents: 9; **Opponents:** 19

Discussion:

Commissioner Riess informs those in attendance that he was Vice-Chairman of the Planning Group when this proposal was presented to them. He is very familiar with the church and is a Bonita resident.

The Sweetwater Planning Group has recommended approval of this Major Use Permit Modification, and so do many of the community's residents. The applicant's representative explains that the church has been at this location for the last 50 years, and this Modification is requested to accommodate the growth that has occurred over that time. This proposal includes an approximate \$105,000 in Traffic Impact Fees, in addition to improvements such as widening the existing drainage channel, placing rip-rap up- and down-stream, and installing a box culvert to relieve existing drainage problems.

The applicant informs the Planning Commission that the congregation has met in the Parrish Hall for the past 50 years and, because church membership has grown over the years, a lot of the programs are now being held on the lawn. He clarifies that this is - and always will be - a neighborhood church. The applicant explains that the project is to be phased over the next 15 to 20 years. Phase 1 will encompass construction of the sanctuary and site improvements to drainage and parking, and Phase 2 will allow the modernization of the existing fellowship hall. Phase 3, the daycare center, and will not occur for approximately 18 years.

SPA 05-003 and R06-002, Agenda Item 2:

At buildout, only 14% of the property will be developed. The applicant's representative clarifies, in response to concerns raised by neighborhood residents, that Grevilla Way will not be used for access to the church and there is no plan to locate the structures at the rear of the site.

Project opponents acknowledge that the church operators have been good neighbors, but are very concerned about the proposed 60-children daycare center and the traffic the proposed modifications could possibly generate. They explain that some of the adjacent roads are already at near-gridlock and question how the Traffic Study can make conclusions about how Phase 3 will impact traffic circulation. Project opponents are also concerned about noise impacts, drainage, and impacts on the existing Grevilla oaks. They insist that many of their neighbors never received notification of this proposal or about today's hearing, and urge the Planning Commission to postpone consideration of the project.

The applicant's representatives reiterate that access/egress will not change from what it is currently, and that they are requesting the Major Use Permit Modification to accommodate their increase in parishioners over the past 50 years. They inform the Planning Commissioners that the sanctuary and fellowship hall will never be in use simultaneously. The applicant's representative also reminds the Commission that if Noise Ordinance violations occur, County enforcement will investigate and take action. The Grevilla oaks will be preserved and protected.

With respect to noticing requirements, Staff informs the Commission that notification of the proposal was sent to everyone within a 300-foot radius of the project site, and notices were also posted at the church and in newspapers. Commissioner Brooks notes that Hill Street residents are outside the 300-foot radius, but they will be impacted by the proposal because Hill Street is not a through-street. He believes the Commission should postpone taking action on this proposal until the community's residents' concerns about noise, traffic, drainage and stormwater runoff have been discussed with church representatives.

Action: Brooks - Woods

Continue consideration of Major Use Permit Modification P56-020W¹ to the meeting of March 10, 2006. During the interim, the applicant is to meet with community residents to review and discuss their proposed Modifications to the property and the church.

SPA 05-003 and R06-002, Agenda Item 2:

Discussion of the Action:

Commissioner Riess supports the Motion, and directs church representatives to meet in their sanctuary with neighboring property owners so they can review and discuss their plans. He, too, agrees that the church operators have been very good neighbors for many, many years.

Commissioner Beck also supports the Motion. He requests that Staff be prepared at that time to clarify how this proposal will impact private roads, provide simple schematics of the roads in the area that indicate how this proposal may impact them, and provide verification of the footprint of the proposed Modifications. Commissioner Beck also requests that Staff be prepared to clearly explain why buildout will occur over an 18-year period, and provide a discussion on the County's noticing requirements because he believes private roads should be treated a little differently.

Commissioners Kreitzer and Woods recommend that DPW representatives return with responses to concerns raised about existing storm-drainage problems, traffic intercirculation. Commissioner Miller recommends that the Major Use Permit Modification specify that the sanctuary and fellowship hall will never be in use at the same time, and suggests that the exit at the far end of the project site be used for emergency access. Commissioner Miller believes this solution will alleviate community residents' fears about impacts on the existing oak trees. Discussing the proposed day-care facility, Commissioner Miller informs the applicants that the Commission usually requests that applicants provide them with all of the plans for project sites, thereby discouraging "piece-meal" development.

Ayes:	7 -	Beck, Brooks, Day, Kreitzer, Miller, Riess, Woods
Noes:	0 -	None
Abstain:	0 -	None
Absent:	0 -	None

E. Director's Report

Staff informs the Commissioners that the County of San Diego has entered into contracts with local fire districts and the California Department of Forestry to keep the fire stations open year-round. Commissioner Beck discusses the numerous letters his neighbor has received during the last two years urging her to perform fire clearance on her property. The local fire district has indicated in writing that her property is fire safe, but the letters from the private subcontractors hired by the fire district continue to be posted on her property, and she is at a loss as to how to stop them. This has become extremely frustrating for Commissioner Beck's neighbor, and has resulted in problems with her insurance company. Though DPLU has no connection to these subcontractors, the Department's Fire Marshall/Fire Services Coordinator will look into this matter.

F. Report on actions of Planning Commission's Subcommittees:

There were none.

G. Designation of member to represent the Planning Commission at Board of Supervisors meeting(s):

Comm. Riess will represent the Planning Commission at the March 1, 2006 Board of Supervisors meeting.

H. Discussion of correspondence received by the Planning Commission:

There was none.

Department Report**I. Scheduled Meetings:**

February 24, 2006	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
March 10, 2006	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
March 24, 2006	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
April 7, 2006	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
April 21, 2006	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room

Scheduled Meetings:

May 5, 2006	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
May 19, 2006	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
June 2, 2006	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
June 16 2006	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
June 30, 2006	Planning Commission Workshop, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
July 14, 2006	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
July 28, 2006	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
August 11, 2006	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
August 25, 2006	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
September 8, 2006	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
September 22, 2006	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
October 6, 2006	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
October 20, 2006	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
November 3, 2006	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
November 17, 2006	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
December 1, 2006	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
December 15, 2006	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room

There being no further business to be considered at this time, the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 10:27 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. on February 24, 2006 in the DPLU Hearing Room, 5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B, San Diego, California.